

Appl. No. 10/807,421
Amdt. Dated June 30, 2006
Reply to Office Action of April 4, 2006

REMARKS

Amendments to Specification

Applicant has amended the title to be more descriptive and has amended Paragraphs 0018 and 0025 merely to address indefiniteness therein and to be more consistent with the present invention, as claimed. Therefore, there is no new matter entered.

Amendments to Claims

Claims 1, 2, 4, 7-9, 11, 14, 16 and 17 have been amended to more explicitly and correctly express the present invention. Therefore, there is no new matter entered.

Election/Restrictions

Applicant respectfully thanks the Examiner for his reconsideration of the Election and Restriction requirements. Accordingly, Applicant acknowledges that all pending claims have indeed been examined on the merits.

Objections to the Specification

Responsive to the objection to the title, Applicant has amended the title, keeping in mind the comments offered by the Examiner. As such, Applicant submits that the amended title is now in allowable form.

Appl. No. 10/807,421
Amdt. Dated June 30, 2006
Reply to Office Action of April 4, 2006

Responsive to the objection to the disclosure based on informalities, Applicant has replaced the word "orbits" with a more appropriate term "runners" that is consistent with the structure and functionality of the elements numbered 214. Applicant submits that the disclosure, as amended, is now in allowable form.

Claim Objections

Claims 2 and 9 are objected to because of the following informalities: both claims contain the word "orbits" and are objected to for the reasons set forth above in the objection to the specification. Appropriate correction is required.

In response to the objection, Applicant has amended claims 2 and 9 to overcome the objection and has specifically changed the word "orbits" into "runners". Further, Applicant submits that the runners are actually slide-connection elements defined by the bottom plate, the at least three sidewalls, and the flanges, rather than being simply "upright walls labeled 214", as suggested by the Examiner. Support for such a meaning can be found, e.g., in Paragraph 0018. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claims 2 and 9, as amended, are clear and definite and thus now in allowable form.

Claim 16 is objected to because of the following informalities: Line 2 of claim 16 has a spelling error, and, particularly, "duffering" should be "diffusing". Appropriate correction is required.

In response to the objection, Applicant has amended claim 16, as well as Paragraph 0025, to overcome the objection and to specifically change the

Appl. No. 10/807,421
Amdt. Dated June 30, 2006
Reply to Office Action of April 4, 2006

word “duffering” into “diffusing”, consistent with the suggestions of the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 16, as amended, is clear and definite and thus now in allowable form.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 112

Claims 4 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the elements. The omitted elements are: free ends of the side rims being bent towards the outside of the movable case, should instead be bent towards the inside, as supported by specification, (paragraph 0018).

In response to the rejection, Applicant has amended claims 4 and 11 in order to overcome the rejection and specifically more particularly change the word “outside” into “inside”. Thus, amended claims 4 and 11 should be allowable.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1-3 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by USPN 3,433,548 to Moore or USPN 3,544,187 to Hils.

In response to this rejection, Applicant has amended claims 1 and 2 and otherwise respectfully traverses the rejection and submits that claims 1-3 and 5 are allowable over Moore or Hils.

Amended claim 1 recites, in part:

A frame for a backlight module, comprising:

Appl. No. 10/807,421
Amdt. Dated June 30, 2006
Reply to Office Action of April 4, 2006

a stable case ...;
a movable case ...;
wherein the movable case is slideably connected with the
stable case by connecting elements to together form an
adjustable receiving access configured for holding the
backlight module. (Emphasis added.)

Applicant submits that such a frame, as set forth in amended claim 1, is neither taught, disclosed, nor suggested by Moore, Hils, or any of the other cited references, taken alone or in combination.

In each of Moore and Hils, as indicated by their respective titles, what is actually disclosed is a "filing cabinet". That is, both Moore and Hils are directed to the filing cabinet art. Further, neither teaches or suggests that the filing cabinet thereof could be extended to a use as a frame for a backlight module. In addition, because only "the interior of the drawer is ... accessible" (Col. 1, lines 59-60), the "receiving access" in Moore is not adjustable. Similarly, the "receiving access" in Hils is defined by "the drawer 11 [comprising] a front panel 18, ..., opposing side panels, 20 and 21, a rear panel 22, and a bottom panel 23 securely affixed together..." (Col. 3, lines 14-17) and is also not adjustable. As such, both Moore and Hils fail to disclose or suggest "an adjustable receiving access that is configured for holding the backlight module", as required by amended claim 1. (Emphasis added.)

Accordingly, Applicant submits that neither Moore and Hils, whether taken alone or in combination with any of the other cited references, anticipates or otherwise renders obvious the limitations in amended claim 1

Appl. No. 10/807,421
Amdt. Dated June 30, 2006
Reply to Office Action of April 4, 2006

of the present frame. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of amended claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Claims 2, 3, and 5 directly or indirectly depend from independent claim 1 and therefore should also be allowable.

Claims 8 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US 2002/0075667 to Kawashima et al.

In response to this rejection, Applicant has amended claim 8 and otherwise respectfully traverses the rejection and submits that claim 8 is allowable over Kawashima et al.

Amended claim 8 recites, in part:

A backlight module, comprising: ...
a frame with an adjustable receiving access ...,
comprising:
a stable case comprising a bottom plate and at least
three sidewalls connected to the bottom plate;
a movable case ...;
wherein the movable case is slideably connected with the
stable case by connecting elements to together form the
adjustable receiving access. (Emphasis added.)

Applicant submits that such a backlight module, as set forth in amended claim 8, is neither taught, disclosed, nor suggested by Kawashima et al. or any of the other cited references, taken alone or in combination.

Appl. No. 10/807,421
Amdt. Dated June 30, 2006
Reply to Office Action of April 4, 2006

In discussing Kawashima et al., the Examiner contends that “[a] backlight module (1), comprising . . . a frame (7a, 7b) . . . comprising a stable case comprising a bottom plate (7a), ...; a movable case (7b) ...; wherein the movable case is slideably connected with the stable case by connecting elements”. However, Applicant submits that, in Kawashima et al., the label 7a does not denote a bottom plate, especially not so within the context of claim 8, as amended. In fact, Applicant submits that Kawashima et al. neither disclose nor suggest that the stable case comprises a bottom plate in any manner and thus fails to anticipate or render obvious claim 8.

Furthermore, in Kawashima et al., “[p]rojections 41b, 42b, 43b and 44b ... are fitted into the openings 41a to 44a ..., respectively” (Col. 4, lines 7-11) (Emphasis added.). Accordingly, there is no combination of features of “a frame with an adjustable receiving access” (i.e., Kawashima et al. effectively have only a single receiving position within the frame thereof) and a “movable case” that “is slideably connected with the stable case”, as claimed in amended claim 8 (Emphasis added.). As such, Kawashima et al. fail to disclose or suggest the subject matter of amended claim 8.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that Kawashima et al., taken alone or in combination with any of the other cited references, does not anticipate or otherwise render obvious the limitations in amended claim 8 of the present invention. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of amended claim 8 is respectfully requested.

In response to the rejection of claim 17, Applicant has amended claim 17 and otherwise respectfully traverses the rejections thereof and submits that amended claim 17 is allowable over Kawashima et al.

Appl. No. 10/807,421
Amdt. Dated June 30, 2006
Reply to Office Action of April 4, 2006

Amended claim 17 recites, in part:

A frame ..., comprising: ...
a connecting element comprising sliding parts and receiving slots respectively formed in the two separated cases, wherein the two separated cases are slideably connected by the connecting element to form an adjustable receiving access ... (Emphasis added.)

Applicant submits that such a frame, as set forth in amended claim 17, is neither taught, disclosed, nor suggested by Kawashima et al. or any of the other cited references, taken alone or in combination.

In discussing Kawashima et al., the Examiner contends that the reference sets forth “[a] frame ..., comprising: . . . a connecting element comprising sliding parts and receiving slots (41a, 42a, 43a, 44a, 41b, 42b, 43b, 44b) . . . , whereby the two separated cases and the connecting element form a receiving access ...” However, Applicant submits that, in Kawashima et al., the labels 41b, 42b, 43b, 44b denote projections (Paragraph 0036) rather than sliding parts. Furthermore, in Kawashima et al., because “[p]rojections 41b, 42b, 43b and 44b ... are fitted into the openings 41a to 44a ..., respectively” (Paragraph 0036), there is no feature of “the two separated cases are slideably connected by the connecting element”, as claimed in amended claim 17. Specifically, in Kawashima et al., once the projections 41b, 42b, 43b and 44b are fitted into the openings 41a to 44a, the “receiving access” of the frame is fixed and not adjustable. As such, Kawashima et al. fail to disclose or suggest the subject matter of amended claim 17. (Emphasis added.)

Appl. No. 10/807,421
Amdt. Dated June 30, 2006
Reply to Office Action of April 4, 2006

Accordingly, Applicant submits that Kawashima et al., taken alone or in combination with any of the other cited references, does not anticipate or otherwise render obvious the limitations in amended claim 17 of the present invention. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of amended claim 17 is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 2002/0075667 to Kawashima et al. in view of US 20040105251 to Yu et al.

In response to this rejection, Applicant respectfully indicates that claims 15 and 16 directly or indirectly depend from independent claim 8, which is in condition for allowance for the reasons set forth above. Applicant accordingly submits that claims 15 and 16 therefore should also be allowable.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner has indicated that "claims 6, 7, 9, 10 and 12-14 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims", for which courtesy the Examiner is thanked.

Dependent claims 6 and 7 directly or indirectly depend from allowable independent claim 1, and therefore should also be allowable. Dependent

JUN-30-2006 10:17

7147384649 P.17

Appl. No. 10/807,421
Amended, Dated June 30, 2006
Reply to Office Action of April 4, 2006

claims 9, 10 and 12-14 directly or indirectly depend from allowable independent claim 8, and therefore should also be allowable. Accordingly, the placement of any or all such claims in independent form at this juncture in prosecution has been respectfully held in abeyance.

In view of the foregoing, the present application as claimed in the pending claims is considered to be in a condition for allowance, and an action to such effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Kun-Jung Tsai

By


Jeffrey T. Knapp

Registration No.: 45,384

Foxconn International, Inc.

1650 Memorex Drive

Santa Clara, CA 95050

Tel. No.: 714/626-1229